DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 103 JC 700 246

TITLE	A Follow-up Study on the Characteristics and Opinions of Students Enrolled in Occupational Education Programs or in University-Parallel Programs at Tarrant County Junior College District.
INSTITUTION	Tarrant County Junior Coll. District, Ft. Worth, Tex.
PUB DATE	Aug 70
NOTE	64p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.30
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Analysis, Demography, Individual Characteristics, *Junior Colleges, *School Demography, *Student Attitudes, *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

To measure the success of the recently opened Tarrant County Junior College, a follow-up study was conducted to determine personal characteristics of students, their opinions of their studies at this school, and their post-Tarrant County Junior College activities. Surveys were designed for a group of students who had taken at least one occupational education course and for another group who should have completed 60 credit hours by the end of spring semester 1969 (university-parallel students). This study analyzes the students' responses to these two surveys, which are included in the appendices. The surveys sought such information as place of residence, sex, age of respondents, marital status, and prior college experience. The two groups of students were also compared on their opinions of selected factors, e.g., faculty interest in students (faculty advisement) at the college. These and other areas are analyzed with the aid of tables. Findings and conclusions are presented in a summary of the study. (RC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED044103

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY ON THE CHARACTERISTICS AND OPINIONS OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS OR IN UNIVERSITY-PARALLEL PROGRAMS AT TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Office of Research and Development

Tarrant County Junior College District

Fort Worth, Texas

JC 700 246

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 18 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

August, 1970

PREFACE TO THE REPORT

This report represents the first "extensive" follow-up of students who have attended Tarrant County Junior College since its opening in Fall, 1967.

Actually, the study was based on two separate surveys: one of students who were enrolled in an occupational education course (or courses) during the spring semester, 1969, and one of students enrolled in university-parallel study. The latter group included all Associate in Arts degree recipients during 1968-69 as well as a randomly selected group of students who were to have completed 60-or-more semester hours of college credit by the end of the spring semester, 1968-69.

The questionnaires were developed to secure data for each of the two groups; however, several types of data were common to each group. Consequently, the organization of this report is based on data common to all students as well as data specifically applicable to one group.

Most of this report is based on data collected from the two university-parallel subgroups (graduates and non-graduates) and the occupational education graduates. A separate report will be prepared based on data from the occupational education non-graduates.

Appreciation must be extended to the several persons who assisted in identifying, organizing, tabulating and preparing this data; and to the hundreds of students who cooperated by providing information for this report.

Finally, this report should be considered a working paper; while the manuscript format is somewhat formal, the narrative, hopefully, affords comprehension without academic trappings or excessive "educationeze."

The reader is invited to draw his own conclusions and to identify areas which should be included in subsequent studies. Your reactions, suggestions, and comments are earnestly requested.

Horace Griffitts
Director of Research

Jimmie C. Styles
Vice Chancellor for Research
and Development

August, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH METHODS	
	Introduction	1:01
	Importance of the Study	1:01
	Statement of the Problem	1:01
	Purposes of the Study	1:02
	Definition of Terms	1:02
	Research Methods	1:03
	Occupational Education Survey	1:03
	University-Parallel Survey	1:04
	Overview	1:05
II.	ANALYSIS OF COMMON CHARACTERISTICS OF UNIVERSITY-PARALLEL AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS	
	Introduction	2:01
	Place of Residence	2:01
	Sex of the Respondents	2:01
	Age of the Respondents	2:03
	Marital Status While at TCJC	2:04
	Prior College Experience	2:04
	Chapter Summary	2:06
III.	COMPARISON OF UNIVERSITY-PARALLEL AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS ON SELECTED FACTORS AT TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE	
	Introduction	3:01
	Present Activities	3:01
	Opinions of Tarrant County Junior College	3:03
	Opinions on Faculty Interest in Students	3:05
	Opinions on Academic Advisement	3:05
	Opinions on the Quality of Instruction	3:08
	Chapter Summary	3:10
IV.	ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION GRADUATES	
	Introduction	4:01
	Areas of Study	4:01
	Office Occupations	4:02
	General Office	4:02
	General Secretarial	4:02
	Legal Secretarial	4:03
	Associate Degree Nursing	4:03
	Mid-Management	4:04
	Electronics Technology	4:04
	Data Processing	4:05
	Law Enforcement	4:05
	Chapter Summary	4:05

Table of Contents (Continued)

Chapter		Page
V.	CHARACTERISTICS OF UNIVERSITY-PARALLEL GRADUATES AND SELECTED NON-GRADUATES	
	Introduction	5:01
	Transfers to Senior Institutions	5:01
	TCJC and Senior Institutions	5:01
	Quality of Instruction	5:01
	Academic Standards	5:03
	Faculty Interest	5:03
	Instructional Media	5:03
	Class Size	5:04
	Grading and Testing	5:04
	Overall Opinion	5:04
	Transferability of Courses	5:04
	Non-Transfer Responses	5:05
	General Characteristics	5:05
	General Information from University-Parallel Students/Awareness of Financial Aid Services	5:06
	Evaluation of the Counseling Program	5:08
	Quality of the Counseling Program	5:08
	Counseling Center's Serving Personal and Academic Needs	5:08
	Personal Problem Counseling	5:09
	Career-Choice Counseling	5:10
	Summary on Counseling Program	5:10
	Student Activities Program	5:12
	Quality of the Student Activities Program	5:12
	Serving Social and Cultural Needs	5:13
	Transcript Requests from Non-Respondents Who Were Enrolled in University-Parallel Programs	5:14
	University-Parallel Graduates	5:14
	Non-Graduate Requests	5:14
VI.	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
	Summary of the Study	6:01
	Findings and Conclusions	6:01
	Recommendations	6:07
VII.	APPENDICES	

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter	Table		Page
II.	I.	Place of Respondent's Residence	2:02
	II.	Age Distribution of Respondents	2:03
	III.	Marital Status of Respondents While Enrolled at TCJC	2:04
	IV.	Prior College Experience Before Entering TCJC	2:05
III.	I.	Analysis of Students and Their Present Education Status	3:02
	II.	Respondent's Rating on Their Over-All Opinion of TCJC	3:04
	III.	Respondent's Rating of Faculty Interest in Individual Students	3:06
	IV.	Respondent's Rating of Academic Advisement	3:07
	V.	Respondent's Rating of the Quality of Instruction	3:09
IV.	I.	Major Areas of Study of Occupational Education Graduates	4:01
	II.	Present Employment Status of Occupational Education Graduates	4:06
V.	I.	Transfer Institutions and Major Areas of Study	5:02
	II.	Comparison of TCJC and Senior Institutions	5:03
	III.	Student Awareness of Financial Aids Services	5:07
	IV.	Type of Aid Received	5:07
	V.	Opinions on the Quality of the Counseling Center Program	5:08
	VI.	Opinions on Counseling Center's Serving Personal and Academic Needs	5:09
	VII.	Opinions on Personal Problem Counseling	5:09

List of Tables (Continued)

Chapter - Table			Page
V.	VIII.	Opinions on the Quality of Career-Choice Counseling	5:10
	IX.	Composite of Ratings on Counseling Programs	5:11
	X.	Opinions on the Quality of the Student Activities Program	5:13
	XI.	Opinion of Student Activities Program's Serving Social and Cultural Needs	5:13

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

The comprehensive community junior college is a community-oriented, student-centered institution. One measure of an institution's success is an analysis of the success of its students as well as an analysis of the students' opinions regarding their learning environment and experiences.

A follow-up study can be particularly useful in identifying basic characteristics and in measuring attitudes and opinions. Therefore, the follow-up device was determined to be the most reliable and efficient means of securing data required from a research population of more than 2,500 students.

Importance of this Study

Tarrant County Junior College is committed to several basic objectives. One of these objectives is to develop an occupational education program based on needs of the employment sector and abilities of students. Another objective is to provide a top-quality university-parallel program for students working toward the baccalaureate degree.

Now in its third year of operation--with over 9,000 students on two campuses--there is an adequate historical base on which to begin a systematic follow-up program.

TCJC is committed to constantly and consistently evaluating its programs to determine their relevance, and to improving these programs by determining identifiable strengths and weaknesses.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to survey occupational education and university-parallel students who were enrolled in the Spring, 1969, semester

in order to determine their personal characteristics, their opinions and attitudes regarding their study at Tarrant County Junior College, and their post-TCJC activities.

Purposes of the Study. The following purposes reflect the scope of this study:

1. to identify basic personal characteristics of students including sex, marital status while at TCJC, and age.

2. to determine the extent of their college experience prior to entering TCJC.

3. to determine the extent to which TCJC students entered senior colleges or entered full-time employment.

4. to determine the characteristics of TCJC students including geographic mobility and occupational status.

5. to identify the opinions of TCJC students on specific phases of TCJC's operations, including such factors as the quality of instruction; the value and content of general education; the faculty interest in students; and quality of the counseling program.

There were two other purposes of the study: to provide data for a report required by the Texas Education Agency on occupational education students and to develop, for periodic refinement, survey instruments for subsequent studies.

Definition of Terms. For the purposes of this study, the following terms are defined:

occupational education student - a student enrolled in a course (or courses), funded by the Texas Education Agency, leading to occupational competency.

university-parallel student - a student enrolled in a program leading to the Associate in Arts degree.

full-time student - a student who is enrolled in 12-or-more semester hours of study at TCJC.

part-time student - a student who is enrolled in less than 12 semester hours of study at TCJC.

"same" area of employment - that field in which the student is employed full-time and in which he is enrolled at TCJC.

"related" area of employment - that field of employment which is related in some direct way to the student's major area of study at TCJC.

"unrelated" area of employment - that area of employment which is not directly or closely related to his major area of study at TCJC.

"native student" - that institution in which a student does his first post-secondary study.

Research Methods

This study is the result of two independent surveys: one survey included only occupational education students and the other included university-parallel students. The following narrative defines the research methods for each of these surveys.

Occupational Education Student Survey

TCJC is required to submit a follow-up study report to the Texas Education Agency on each of its occupational education graduates. This study was undertaken to provide basic data for the TEA report as well as to secure data of particular interest to our institution.

Development of the Instrument. A sub-committee of the Research Advisory Committee began working on the instrument during the summer of 1969. In early October, 1969, a draft questionnaire was reviewed by some members of the sub-committee. (For a copy of the instrument used in this study, see Appendix I.)

Selection of the Sample. To accomplish established objectives, the entire population of students enrolled in one or more occupational education

courses for the spring semester, 1968-69, at TCJC was the subject of study; this group totaled 2,392 students and they were enrolled in one of the following programs:

Aeronautical Technology
Architectural Technology
Automobile Mechanics
Automotive Technology
Data Processing
Drafting and Design
Electronics Technology
Fire Technology
Law Enforcement
Mid-Management
Associate Diploma Nursing
Office Occupations
  General Office
  General Secretarial
  Legal Secretarial
  Medical Secretarial
  Accounting
Refrigeration and Air Conditioning

Collection Procedures. The mailing included the survey instrument, a letter of transmittal from Vice Chancellor Jimmie C. Styles, and a business reply envelope. The mailing to the 2,392 subjects was made on October 20, 1969.

No second mailing was attempted except for a personally typed letter to all graduates who had not replied by October 31, 1969.

Exactly 700 usable replies were received, equivalent to a return of 29.4 percent. Of the 700 replies, 39 were from occupational education graduates of which there were 55 during the 1968-69 academic year. The rate of return from graduates of occupational programs was 70.9 percent.

University-Parallel Student Survey

Development of the Instrument. The research instrument was developed in cooperation with selected campus personnel. Some of the questions used in the Occupational Education Student Survey were also used in this instrument; a copy of this instrument is shown in Appendix II.

Selection of the Sample. During the academic year, 1968-69, a total of 55 students completed the requirements for the Associate in Arts degree.

Because of the small number as well as the recognition that many students elect not to complete the specific requirements of the degree, an additional 67 students were randomly selected. These 67 students were selected from those students who were enrolled in university-parallel programs and who should have completed 60-or-more semester hours by the end of the 1968-69 spring semester.

Collection Procedures. On January 7, 1970, a survey instrument, letter of transmittal from the Director of Research, and a return envelope were mailed to the 122 subjects included in this study. A second mailing was made on January 23, 1970.

Usable responses were received from 44 of the 55 graduates, equivalent to a return rate of 80 percent; 44 replies were received from the 67 non-graduates, equivalent to a return of 65.7 percent.

Overview

The following chapters are based on an analysis of responses to the surveys.

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF COMMON CHARACTERISTICS OF UNIVERSITY-PARALLEL AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with descriptive data collected from both university-parallel students and occupational education students.

Place of Residence

Of the 788 students who responded to the survey, 721 (91.5%) continued to reside in Tarrant County. Table I, on the following page, summarizes the place of residence by sex of the respondents.

Group IV (occupational education non-graduates) had the highest local retention rate: 94 percent; Group I (university-parallel graduates) had the lowest rate: 70 percent. This occurrence can be attributed to the fact that a number of the university-parallel graduates and non-graduates have left the Tarrant County area to complete the baccalaureate degree.

Just over two percent (16) of all respondents had moved from Texas; 30 (4%) of the respondents were residing in a county adjacent to Tarrant County, and 21 (2%) of the respondents resided in other areas of Texas.

No trends could be gauged to identify if one sex was more mobile than the other.

Sex of the Respondents

Of the 44 responses received from university-parallel program graduates, 15 (34%) were males; forty-four replies were received from the randomly sampled group of university-parallel students, 20 (46%) of which were from males.

Replies were received from 39 graduates of occupational education programs and only 6 (15%) were from males. However, of the 661 replies

TABLE I

PLACE OF RESPONDENT'S RESIDENCE

Place of Residence	University-Parallel								Occupational Education								TOTAL			
	Group I				Group II				Group III				Group IV				All Groups			
	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%
Tarrant County	11	20	31	71	13	20	33	75	5	29	34	87	399	224	623	94	428	293	721	9
Contiguous County	1	4	5	11	2	0	2	5	1	3	4	10	14	5	19	3	18	12	30	
Other County, Texas	2	3	5	11	4	3	7	16	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	2	12	9	21	
Other County, Other State	1	2	3	7	1	1	2	5	0	1	1	3	7	3	10	2	9	7	16	

(Group I - university-parallel graduates; Group II - university-parallel non-graduates; Group III - occupational education graduates; Group IV - occupational education students enrolled, spring, 1969.)

received from non-graduates of occupational education programs, 399 (60%) were from men.

More specific details are shown in Table II as follows:

TABLE II

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

AGE	Group I				Group II				Group III				Group IV	
	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	T*	%
under 22	10	20	30	68	13	15	28	64	2	16	18	46	242	37
22 - 25	4	5	9	20	3	3	6	14	2	5	7	18	101	15
26 - 30	0	2	2	5	3	0	3	7	1	2	3	8	117	18
over 30	1	2	3	7	1	6	7	16	1	10	11	28	201	30
Total	15	29	44	100	20	24	44	101	6	33	39	100	661	100

* This group was not computed by sex.

Age of the Respondents

Of the four identified groups, the occupational education non-graduates (Group IV) tended to be more evenly divided between the four age classifications: 37 percent were "under 22," and 30 percent were "over 30."

Of the two groups of graduates (Group I and Group III), the occupational education graduates--as a group--were older than their university-parallel counterparts. Of the university-parallel graduates, 68 percent were "under 22" years of age, while only 46 percent of the occupational education graduates were in this age classification.

It should be stated that the "older" graduates tended to be women, though this finding is not deemed surprising. It may be surprising to note that less than one-half of the occupational education graduates were "under 22" years of age.

Marital Status While at TCJC

Three-fourths of the university-parallel graduates (Group I) were single while enrolled at TCJC; about two-thirds of the university-parallel non-graduates (Group II) and the occupational education graduates (Group III) were single. But of the occupational education non-graduates group, almost 60 percent were married while enrolled at TCJC. Of all respondents, one person was widowed and twenty-seven were divorced.

No consistency existed when marital status was compared to the age of the respondents.

Table III summarizes the data on the marital status of the respondents while enrolled at TCJC.

TABLE III

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS WHILE ENROLLED AT TCJC

Marital Status	Group I				Group II				Group III				Group IV	
	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	M	F	T	%	T*	%
Single	10	23	33	75	14	15	29	66	4	22	26	67	246	37
Married	3	6	9	20	6	8	14	32	2	10	12	31	391	59
Widowed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Divorced	2	0	2	5	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	23	4
Total	15	29	44	100	20	24	44	100	6	33	39	100	661	100

* This group was not computed by sex.

Prior College Experience

In each phase of the study, respondents were asked to indicate if they had attended a college prior to enrolling at TCJC.

Almost one-third of all respondents had attended another college before entering TCJC. The university-parallel graduates ranked lowest of the four groups: 12 of 44 (27%) had attended another college; the highest rate was earned by the university-parallel non-graduates: 21 of 44 (48%). Of each of the occupational education groups, just over one-third had attended another college--36 percent of the graduates and 34 percent of the non-graduates.

Table IV shows the number and percent of students who had prior college experience before entering TCJC and those who were "native" TCJC students.

TABLE IV

PRIOR COLLEGE EXPERIENCE BEFORE ENTERING TCJC

Prior College?	Group I		Group II		Group III		Group IV		Total	
	T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%	T	%
Yes	12	27	21	48	14	36	211	34	258	34
No	32	73	23	52	25	64	405	66	485	66
TOTAL	44	100	44	100	39	100	616*	100	743	100

* Information was not supplied by 45 respondents in this group.

The 258 respondents who had attended another college represented transfers from 75 junior and senior colleges in 21 states and the District of Columbia; the states were:

Arkansas
Alabama
California
Florida
Georgia
Iowa
Louisiana
Maryland
Massachusetts
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
New Mexico
Pennsylvania
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Washington
West Virginia

Chapter Summary

Over 91 percent of the respondents continued to reside in Tarrant County, with another four percent in contiguous counties. The highest migration from the county was from the university-parallel students, who, for the most part, were enrolled in senior institutions outside Tarrant and adjoining counties.

About two-thirds of the university-parallel graduates were "under 22" years of age; occupational education students tended to be "older" than their university-parallel counterparts.

Those who had actually graduated--either university-parallel or in an occupational program--tended to be single: three-fourths of the university-parallel and two-thirds of the occupational education graduates were not married while attending TCJC.

Slightly over one-third of all the respondents had attended another college prior to entering TCJC. These respondents had attended colleges in 21 states and the District of Columbia.

CHAPTER III

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSITY-PARALLEL AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS ON SELECTED FACTORS AT TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with a comparison of university-parallel and occupational education students on selected activities at TCJC as well as an analysis of their present activities.

Present Activities

Replies were received from 88 students who had been enrolled in university-parallel programs at TCJC; 44 of the responses were from those who had received Associate in Arts degrees, and 44 responses were from the randomly selected group. Replies were also received from 39 graduates of occupational programs and from 661 students who were enrolled in occupational courses last spring.

Of the 44 responses from university-parallel graduates, 36 (82%) were presently enrolled in a senior college; of the non-graduate group, 32 of 44 (73%) were currently enrolled in a senior college. One person in the latter group was still enrolled at TCJC.

Overall, of the 88 replies from university-parallel enrollees, 68 (77%) were attending a senior college; this is an impressive finding.

For the graduates from occupational education programs, four (10%) of the 39 respondents were enrolled in a senior college; one graduate was continuing study at TCJC. Significantly, there were six men who were graduates of occupational education programs; three of these six were continuing their educations in senior colleges.

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS AND THEIR PRESENT

EDUCATION STATUS

Groups	Total	Senior College	Junior College		Not in Other College
			TCJC	Other	
Group I: Male	15	13	0	0	2
Female	29	23	0	0	6
Total	44	36	0	0	8
Group II: Male	20	15	0	0	5
Female	24	17	1	0	6
Total	44	32	1	0	11
Group III: Male	6	3	0	0	3
Female	33	1	1	0	31
Total	39	4	1	0	34
Group IV: Total	661	29	412	3	217
TOTAL	788	101	414	3	487

As shown in Table I on the previous page, 29 of the 661 occupational education non-graduates had transferred to a senior college--equivalent to four percent of that group.

Of the occupational education graduates, all were employed except those who were enrolled as full-time students--two of whom were employed part-time. Further discussion of their employment will be found in Chapter IV.

Of the six university-parallel female graduates not enrolled in a senior college, four were employed in part-time positions, one was a full-time homemaker, and one was unemployed; four of the six were married.

Both of the university-parallel male graduates who had not entered a senior college were employed in full-time positions.

Five of the non-graduate university-parallel male respondents had not entered a senior college; four were employed in full-time positions and one was a member of the Armed Forces. Three of the four employed full-time were married. Further analysis of the university-parallel students is found in Chapter V.

Three of the seven non-graduate university-parallel female respondents not enrolled in a senior college were married, two of whom were employed in full-time positions.

Opinions of Tarrant County Junior College

Certain questions were common to both questionnaires in surveying the university-parallel and occupational education students. Respondents were asked to rate each question on a 5-4-3-2-1 scale ("very good"-"good"-"fair"-"poor"-"very poor"). One of the questions was: "What is your overall opinion of TCJC?" Again, analysis was based on the four different groups of respondents as shown in Table II:

TABLE II

RESPONDENT'S RATING ON THEIR OVER-ALL OPINION OF TCJC

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I: Male	7	6	2	0	0	0	15	65	4.33
Female	12	12	3	2	0	0	29	121	4.17
Total	19	18	5	2	0	0	44	186	4.23
Group II: Male	6	11	3	0	0	0	20	83	4.15
Female	14	9	1	0	0	0	24	109	4.54
Total	20	20	4	0	0	0	44	192	4.36
Group III: Male	4	1	1	0	0	0	6	27	4.50
Female	16	13	4	0	0	0	33	144	4.36
Total	20	14	5	0	0	0	39	171	4.38
Group IV: Total	340	235	74	4	0	8	653	2870	4.40
ALL GROUPS	399	287	88	6	0	8	780	3419	4.38

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

Of all the questions, this question received one of the highest ratings. The occupational education non-graduates (Group IV) rated this question at a 4.40 level, closely followed by Group III (occupational education graduates) at the 4.38 level and Group II (university-parallel non-graduates) at the 4.36 level. Of the four groups, the university-parallel graduates had the lowest rating of TCJC with an average of 4.23. The average for the combined groups was 4.38.

Of the three groups which were classified by sex, males in two groups gave a higher rating to TCJC than did females.

Opinions on Faculty Interest in Students

In response to the question, "What is your opinion on faculty interest in individual students?," there was some variation among the groups.

University-parallel graduates rated this factor higher than did the other three groups--at the 4.34 level. Occupational education graduates rated this factor at the 4.05 level--lowest for the four groups. Group II was slightly higher, 4.09, followed by Group IV at 4.15. The average rating for combined groups was 4.16.

There may be an explanation of the variation between the responses of Group I and Group III (graduates); most of Group I had transferred to a senior institution while few of the latter had transferred; hence, the first group had a better "point of reference."

Table III summarizes the data on this question on the next page.

Opinions on Academic Advisement

Each questionnaire asked that the respondent rate on a 5-4-3-2-1 basis their "opinion on the quality of academic advising." Table IV presents the data on this question.

TABLE III

RESPONDENT'S RATING OF FACULTY INTEREST IN

INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I: Male	8	7	0	0	0	0	15	68	4.53
Female	13	10	6	0	0	0	29	123	4.24
Total	21	17	6	0	0	0	44	191	4.34
Group II: Male	6	10	3	1	0	0	20	81	4.05
Female	12	6	3	0	2	1	23	95	4.13
Total	18	16	6	1	2	1	43	176	4.09
Group III: Male	2	3	1	0	0	0	6	25	4.17
Female	13	14	2	2	2	0	33	133	4.03
Total	15	17	3	2	2	0	39	158	4.05
Group IV: Total	275	230	101	27	7	21	640	2659	4.15
ALL GROUPS	329	280	116	30	11	22	766	3184	4.16

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

TABLE IV

RESPONDENT'S RATING OF ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I: Male	3	3	7	2	0	0	15	52	3.47
Female	1	12	8	8	0	0	29	93	3.21
Total	4	15	15	10	0	0	44	145	3.30
Group II: Male	2	6	9	1	0	2	18	63	3.50
Female	2	7	8	1	3	3	21	67	3.19
Total	4	13	17	2	3	5	39	130	3.33
Group III: Male	0	1	2	2	0	1	5	14	2.80
Female	6	16	5	3	3	0	33	118	3.58
Total	6	17	7	5	3	1	38	132	3.47
Group IV: Total	134	193	176	75	28	55	606	2148	3.54
ALL GROUPS	148	238	215	92	34	61	727	2555	3.51

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

Occupational education students rated academic advisement considerably higher than did their university-parallel counterparts. Occupational education non-graduates gave the highest rating to academic advisement of the four groups--3.54, followed closely by occupational education graduates, with a rating of 3.47.

University-parallel non-graduates gave a slightly higher rating, 3.33, to academic advisement than did university-parallel graduates, 3.30. It is interesting to note that among the two university-parallel groups, male respondents rated the factor much higher than did the females.

Male occupational education graduates rated academic advisement lower than any of the other sub-groups--at the 2.80 level--though the rating could be strongly influenced by the very small number of responses to this question.

Opinions on the Quality of Instruction

Both university-parallel and occupational education students were asked to rate the quality of instruction received at TCJC. Table V summarizes the responses for each group.

University-parallel students rated the quality of instruction slightly higher than did their occupational education counterparts. Group II (university-parallel non-graduates) rated the quality of instruction at 4.36, followed by Group I at 4.23.

The occupational education non-graduates rated the quality of instruction at 4.19; the lowest rating for quality of instruction was given by the occupational education graduates at 4.08. When the four groups were combined, the average was 4.18.

In each of the three groups where ratings were computed by sex, women rated the quality of instruction at higher levels than did men.

TABLE V

RESPONDENT'S RATING OF THE QUALITY

OF INSTRUCTION

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I: Male	3	10	2	0	0	0	15	61	4.06
Female	14	11	3	1	0	0	29	125	4.31
Total	17	21	5	1	0	0	44	186	4.23
Group II: Male	7	10	1	1	0	1	19	80	4.21
Female	15	6	1	0	1	1	23	103	4.48
Total	22	16	2	1	1	2	42	183	4.36
Group III: Male	1	4	1	0	0	0	6	24	4.00
Female	9	20	3	0	1	0	33	135	4.09
Total	10	24	4	0	1	0	39	159	4.08
Group IV: Total	231	320	80	12	5	13	648	2704	4.19
ALL GROUPS	280	381	91	14	7	15	773	3232	4.18

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a comparison between university-parallel and occupational education students on their present activities and their ratings of selected factors related to their study at TCJC.

Eighty-eight replies were received from university-parallel graduates and non-graduates; of this group, 68 were presently enrolled in a senior college--equivalent to 77 percent of the total.

Of the occupational education graduates, four were continuing their educations at senior colleges--three of whom were males; one female was continuing study at TCJC. Five of the 39 respondents who had graduated from an occupational education program were still enrolled as full-time students.

Of the remaining 34 respondents, 32 were employed in full-time positions, and two were employed in part-time positions.

In their overall evaluation of TCJC, the average rating for all respondents was 4.38, with occupational education students rating TCJC slightly higher than university-parallel students.

"Faculty interest in individual students" was rated by the entire group at the 4.16 level, with a range of 4.34 by university-parallel graduates to 4.05 by occupational education graduates.

Respondents gave an overall rating of 3.51 to the quality of academic advising; occupational education non-graduates rated it at the 3.54 level while university-parallel graduates rated it lowest, at 3.30.

On the quality of instruction, the entire group rated it at the 4.18 level, with a range of 4.36 by university-parallel non-graduates to a 4.08 by occupational education graduates.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION GRADUATES

Introduction

In the academic year, 1968-69, 55 individuals completed the requirements for the Associate of Applied Arts degrees in specific occupational programs.

Questionnaires were mailed to these graduates in the Fall, 1969; a total of 39 replies were received, equivalent to a 70.9 percent response. This chapter is concerned with specific information supplied by the 39 respondents.

Areas of Study

Slightly over half of all the graduates in occupational education were enrolled in the Associate Degree Nursing program. Table I, which follows, shows the number of graduates of each program and the number of responses that were received:

TABLE I

MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION GRADUATES

Program	Graduates			Replies			Response
	M	F	T	M	F	T	%
Nursing	1	28	29	1	17	18	62.1
Secretarial	0	14	14	0	12	12	85.7
Data Processing	1	4	5	0	3	3	60.0
Electronics	2	1	3	2	1	3	100.0
Mid-Management	2	0	2	2	0	2	100.0
Law Enforcement	2	0	2	1	0	1	50.0
TOTAL	8	47	55	6	33	39	70.9

Women accounted for 85 percent of the total number of graduates, and they were graduates of four different occupational areas. There were only eight male graduates and they represented five different areas.

Unfortunately, no attempt was made to determine the beginning salary level for any of the occupational education graduates.

Office Occupations

Responses were received from 12 of the 14 graduates of office occupations programs; two completed their study in the General Office program; four, in General Secretarial; and six, in Legal Secretarial. All of the respondents were women.

General Office. Both of the general office graduates continued to reside in Tarrant County, though one was employed in Dallas. The other respondent continued study at TCJC and was employed on a part-time basis in a campus office.

The full-time employee listed her title as "secretary" and assumed her position within one month after graduation.

General Secretarial. Each of the four respondents was employed in full-time office positions; all continued to reside in Tarrant County and were employed in Fort Worth.

Three of the respondents were employed within a month of graduation and one was employed within three months after graduation. Three of the respondents listed their title as "stenographer" and one listed "secretary." Employers include two at a major industrial complex, one for a state agency, and one for a private education institution.

All of the respondents were "21 or under," and none had attended any

other college. During their study at TCJC, none of the respondents was married.

Legal Secretarial. Responses were received from six of the seven graduates of the legal secretarial curriculum; five of these six respondents continued to live in Tarrant County; one respondent was a resident of Virginia and was employed by the Central Intelligence Agency.

One of the respondents was married during her study at TCJC, and she was the only respondent who was not "21 or under" years of age.

One respondent was employed part-time for an attorney; all the other respondents were employed full-time and they listed their titles as "secretary," "stenographer," "secretary," "secretary," and legal secretary."

Local employers included General Dynamics, an insurance agency, a large manufacturing firm, and two law firms.

Associate Degree Nursing

Eighteen responses were received from the 29 graduates of the ADN program, equivalent to a 62.1 percent response; these replies were from seventeen women and one man.

Fifteen of the eighteen respondents continued to reside in Tarrant County; two resided in Johnson, and one resided in Parker County. Seven of the respondents were "21 or under"; four were between "22-25" years of age; one was between "26-30"; and six were "over 30" years of age.

One-third of the respondents had attended another college prior to enrolling at TCJC; only one of the graduates (the male respondent) had enrolled in a senior college and was seeking the baccalaureate degree in nursing.

All of the respondents, including the one enrolled in a senior college, were employed in nursing positions on a part-time or full-time basis.

The employers and listed job titles were:

All Saints Hospital
Charge Nurse
Assistant Head Nurse
Assistant Head Nurse
Registered Nurse
Charge Nurse
Graduate Nurse

Peter Smith Hospital
Staff Nurse
Charge Nurse (Graduate)
Graduate Nurse
Graduate Nurse (PT)
Registered Nurse

Johnson County Hospital
Floor Supervisor
Charge Nurse

St. Joseph Hospital
Charge Nurse
Graduate Nurse

Cook Children's Hospital
Nurse
Registered Nurse

In addition, one graduate was a private duty nurse at the time the study was conducted.

Fourteen persons secured their present positions within two months of their graduation, and it appears that most of the graduates assumed their positions within two weeks of graduation. Four other graduates had prior service with their employers before graduation, including one graduate who had been employed at the same hospital since 1959.

Mid-Management

Both of the graduates of the mid-management program responded to the survey, and each resided in Tarrant County.

One of the men had attended another college prior to enrolling at TCJC; the other had transferred to a local college to complete a degree in management and was not employed.

One graduate is the owner of his own business, employing 16 persons; this firm is located in an adjacent county.

Electronics Technology

Each of the three graduates of the electronics technology program provided follow-up information--two men and one woman.

Two of the graduates continued to reside in Tarrant County and both were enrolled as full-time students--one at NTSU and one at UTA. All of the graduates were single when enrolled at TCJC, and the two men had attended another college prior to entering TCJC.

One graduate was residing in an adjacent county and was employed with Southwestern Bell Telephone Company in an electronics position; he assumed his position within three months of graduation.

Data Processing

Three of the five graduates of the data processing curriculum returned the questionnaire; all of the replies were from women.

Two of the respondents were single during their TCJC study, and all of them continue to reside in Tarrant County. Two of the respondents had attended other institutions prior to entering TCJC.

Two respondents were employed full-time with these titles: "general office," and "programmer." The part-time employed respondent was employed as a "bookkeeper."

Law Enforcement

One of the two law enforcement graduates provided follow-up information. He was a resident of Fort Worth, married, and over 30 years of age. He had attended another junior college prior to entering TCJC. He was employed with a local law enforcement unit, where he had been employed for slightly over two years.

Chapter Summary

Over eighty percent (32 of 39) of the occupational education graduates were employed in full-time positions. All were employed in Tarrant County, except for four employed in contiguous counties and one employed outside the state. Table II summarizes the employment status:

TABLE II

PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION GRADUATES

Program	Total	College		Employed		Not in Labor Market
		Senior	Junior	FT	PT	
Nursing	18	1*	0	17	0	0
Secretarial	12	0	1*	10	1	0
Data Processing	3	0	0	2	1	0
Electronics	3	2	0	1	0	0
Mid-Management	2	1	0	1	0	0
Law Enforcement	1	0	0	1	0	0
Total	39	4	1	32	2	0
Percent	100	10.3	2.6	82.1	5.1	0

* Also employed part-time.

It is significant that all of the respondents were in the employment sector or were full-time students.

Four of the graduates were enrolled in senior colleges (one each at TCU, TWC, UTA, and NTSU); one graduate was continuing study at TCJC. Two of these five were also employed in part-time positions related to the area of their TCJC study.

CHAPTER V

CHARACTERISTICS OF UNIVERSITY-PARALLEL STUDENTS AND SELECTED NON-GRADUATES

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the analysis of data from the 88 responses from students who were enrolled in university-parallel programs--44 of whom were graduates and 44 were non-graduates.

This chapter is sub-divided into four parts: one part on those who transferred; one, on those who did not transfer; another on the responses to some general questions appropriate to both groups; and the last on the transcript requests made by non-respondents of the two groups.

Part I. Transfers to Senior Institutions

Sixty-eight (77.3%) of the 88 respondents had entered a senior college when the survey was conducted; further, 52 (76.5%) of the 68 were enrolled in area senior institutions.

Table I, on the following page, shows the transfer institutions and the major areas of study. Almost half (31 of 68) of the students were seeking degrees in education or business.

TCJC and Senior Institutions

Respondents were asked to compare TCJC to their transfer institution on selected factors. This information is found in Table II on page 3.

Quality of Instruction. On the quality of instruction, almost one-half (49%) of the students indicated "no difference"; 34 percent rated TCJC higher than the senior institutions, while 17 percent rated the senior institutions higher than TCJC.

TABLE I

TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS AND MAJOR

AREAS OF STUDY

Areas	TCU	UTA	NTSU	TWC	Other Texas*	OS**	Total
Education	6	0	6	2	4	0	18
Business	2	5	2	1	3	0	13
English	1	0	0	3	3	0	7
Sociology	1	2	1	1	1	0	6
Art	0	4	1	0	0	0	5
History	2	1	0	1	0	1	5
Pre-Law	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Pharmacy	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Unknown	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Other	3	0	2	1	1	1	8
Total	16	15	12	9	14	2	68
Percent	23.5	22.1	17.6	13.2	20.6	2.9	100.0

* includes the University of Houston (4), University of Texas--Austin (2), Stephen F. Austin University (2), University of Texas--El Paso, Texas Tech, Dallas Baptist, Sul Ross State, West Texas State, unknown.

** includes Evangel, Sacramento State.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF TCJC AND SENIOR INSTITUTIONS

Areas:	T C J C				no difference		Senior College				no opinion	
	much better		better				better		much better			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Quality of Instruction	8	12	15	22	32	47	7	10	5	7	1	1
Academic Standards	5	7	4	6	33	49	18	26	7	10	1	1
Faculty Interest	22	32	18	26	21	31	2	3	4	6	1	1
Instructional Media	18	26	31	46	14	21	1	1	2	3	2	3
Class Size	15	22	19	28	30	44	2	3	2	3	0	0
Grading and Testing	4	6	9	13	43	63	7	10	4	6	1	1
Overall Opinion	6	9	24	35	19	28	9	13	4	6	6	9

Academic Standards. Forty-nine percent (33 of 68) of the respondents indicated no difference in the academic standards, while 36 percent indicated the senior colleges had higher standards as compared to 13 percent indicating TCJC's having higher standards.

Faculty Interest. Fifty-eight percent (40 of 68) indicated that TCJC faculty members evidenced greater interest in the student. Expressing "no difference" were 31 percent of the respondents, while 9 percent considered faculty interest greater at senior institutions.

Instructional Media. Almost three-fourths of the respondents rated the use of media at TCJC better than senior colleges; 21 percent expressed "no difference" and 4 percent rated senior institutions higher than TCJC.

Class Size. Exactly one-half of the respondents indicated "class size" at TCJC more to their liking, compared to 6 percent favoring the senior institutions; forty-four percent indicated that there was "no difference."

Grading and Testing. Almost two-thirds (63%) of the respondents indicated no difference in grading and testing practices between TCJC and their senior institution; 19 percent favored TCJC as compared to 16 percent favoring senior college practices.

Overall Opinion. Six individuals (9%) stated no preference between TCJC and their senior institution, while 19 individuals (28%) indicated there was no difference between the institutions. TCJC received a "better" or "much better" rating from 30 individuals (44%) and 13 indicated preference to the senior institution (19%).

Transferability of Courses

Each individual who had entered a senior institution was asked to identify courses in which full-credit was not received.

Here are the responses to the question from those individuals who did not receive "full-credit":

TCJC Major	Present Major	Specific Courses
Pre-Law	Pre-Law	Orientation
Psychology	Psychology	Applied Psychology
Sociology	Sociology	Basic Studies: Nat. Sci., Humanities, Soc. Sci., Communications, and Career Planning
Business	Business	Principles of Management
Marketing	Marketing	Algebra
Spanish	Sociology	Beginning Typing
(not given)	Marketing	Business Law
Social Studies	Social Studies	Office Machines, F. O.
Philosophy	Religion	"Come now! It makes me mad just to think about it. First, only 66 hours transferred, 9 hours didn't out of the 66 hours. I still don't know what will be

TCJC Major	Present Major	Specific Courses excepted by my advisor for the ones in my major. At TCJC, I should of had better counselors, who know their job!!! (sic.)"
Elem. Education	Elem. Education	Child Psychology
Elem. Education	English	Child Psychology
Elem. Education	Elem. Education	Developmental Math
Elem. Education	Elem. Education	"too many music credits in choir."
English	English	Freshman Orientation
(not given)	English	Art Appreciation
(not given)	Sociology	Orientation
Electronics	Math	Electronics
(not given)	Pharmacy	"limited to 66 hours and I have 72."
Accounting	Accounting	Intermediate Accounting
Biology	Biology	English; "most of every-think in the first year."

From the list above, 20 of 68 students (29.4%) did not receive "full-credit" for TCJC courses. It should be stated, however, that some students knew (and indicated so in their responses) that certain courses would not be transferable, but they took the course because of their interest (Choir, for example).

Part II. Non-Transfer Responses

Of the 88 responses from university-parallel student, 68 had entered a senior college.

This part is concerned with the 20 responses from individuals who had not entered a senior college.

General Characteristics

Seven of the non-transfers were males, two of whom had received the A. A. degree. These two were between 22-25 years of age, divorced, with

one child. Both were employed full-time--one as a butcher (history major) and one as an airline sales representative (business major).

Of the five non-graduate males, three were married (one had one child), and employed in full-time positions. The two unmarried, non-transfer males were "21 or under" and employed full-time. Only two in this group identified their TCJC majors.

Six A. A. female graduates had not entered a senior college, four of whom were single and two were married. Five of the six were employed; one as a cashier (biology major), one as a sales clerk (major unknown), one as a mail clerk (history major) and one as a social worker (major unknown). Two were not in the labor market--one was a full-time homemaker (drama major), and one was unemployed (psychology major).

Seven replies were received from non-graduate females who had not entered senior colleges, four of whom were single and three were married. Four of the seven were employed: one, as a Medical Assistant (art major); two, as sales clerks (art major and "unknown"), and one, as a bookkeeper (history major). Also, one respondent was a full-time homemaker (English major); one was unemployed (music major); and one was continuing study at TCJC.

Part III. General Information from University-Parallel Students

Awareness of Financial Aid Services

All respondents were asked if they were aware of the services afforded by the Financial Aids Office. Eight percent of the respondents were not aware of the services, as shown in Table III.

TABLE III

STUDENT AWARENESS OF FINANCIAL AIDS SERVICES

Groups	Total	Percent	Male	Percent	Female	Percent
Unaware	7	8	5	14	2	4
Aware	81	92	30	86	51	96
Total	88	100	35	100	53	100

Perhaps more significant is the fact that 34 of the 81 (42%) respondents who were aware of the service actually received direct assistance. Financial aids services were received by exactly one-third of the men (10 of 30) and almost one-half of the women (24 of 51). The types of aid received are shown in Table IV:

TABLE IV

TYPE.OF AID RECEIVED

Aid	Male	Female	Total
Work Study	4	11	15
Scholarship	6	13	19
Loan	1	2	3
Job Placement	1	2	3
Total	12	28	40

Forty aids were received by the 34 users, almost one-half of which were scholarships, closely followed by work-study opportunities.

Evaluation of the Counseling Program

The respondents were asked to rate several different phases of the counseling program.

Quality of the Counseling Program. In response to the question, "What is your opinion of TCJC on the quality of the Counseling Center program?," the men gave a slightly higher rating than women as shown in Table V, based on a 5-4-3-2-1-0 scale (very good-good-fair-poor-very poor-no opinion):

TABLE V

OPINIONS ON THE QUALITY OF THE COUNSELING CENTER PROGRAM

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I - Male	1	4	6	3	0	1	14	45	3.21
Female	4	9	7	6	3	0	29	92	3.17
Total	5	13	13	9	3	1	43	137	3.19
Group II-Male	4	8	2	3	1	2	18	65	3.61
Female	4	5	8	2	3	2	22	71	3.23
Total	8	13	10	5	4	4	40	136	3.40
Total	13	26	23	14	7	5	83	273	3.29

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

University-parallel non-graduates (Group II) rated the Center's program considerably higher than did their graduate counterparts.

Counseling Center's Serving Personal and Academic Needs

The specific question was, "How well did the Counseling Center serve your personal and academic needs?"

The analysis of the responses is shown in Table VI:

TABLE VI

OPINIONS ON COUNSELING CENTER'S SERVING

PERSONAL AND ACADEMIC NEEDS

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I - Male	1	4	5	1	2	2	13	40	3.08
Female	3	10	7	5	3	1	28	89	3.18
Total	4	14	12	6	5	3	41	129	3.15
Group II - Male	3	4	5	3	1	4	16	53	3.31
Female	3	3	9	2	3	4	20	61	3.05
Total	6	7	14	5	4	8	36	114	3.17
Total	10	21	26	11	9	11	77	243	3.16

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

The difference between the two groups was nominal; however, the males and females were not consistent within the two groups; overall, the respondents rated the question at the 3.16 level.

Personal-Problem Counseling

There was a high degree of consistency on the question of, "the quality of personal-problem counseling?," as shown in Table VII:

TABLE VII

OPINIONS ON PERSONAL-PROBLEM COUNSELING

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I - Male	3	2	5	0	1	4	11	39	3.55
Female	4	6	4	2	1	12	17	61	3.59
Total	7	8	9	2	2	16	28	100	3.57
Group II- Male	1	5	3	2	0	9	11	38	3.45
Female	2	5	5	0	0	12	12	45	3.75
Total	3	10	8	2	0	21	23	83	3.61
Total	10	18	17	4	2	37	51	183	3.59

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

While 37 of 88 students did not respond to the question, the 51 who rated the question gave it a composite rating of 3.59. Women rated the quality of personal problem counseling higher than did men. The graduates were very consistent between the sexes, though there was a .30 spread among the non-graduate group.

Career-Choice Counseling

Respondents rated career-choice counseling just slightly lower than personal problem counseling; for the two groups, the rating was 3.55, as shown in Table VIII:

TABLE VIII

OPINIONS ON THE QUALITY OF CAREER-CHOICE COUNSELING

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I - Male	3	3	3	2	0	4	11	40	3.64
Female	2	11	7	4	0	5	24	83	3.46
Total	5	14	10	6	0	9	35	123	3.51
Group II- Male	3	5	4	1	1	6	14	50	3.57
Female	2	6	7	0	1	8	16	58	3.62
Total	5	11	11	1	2	14	30	108	3.60
Total	10	25	21	7	2	23	65	231	3.55

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

In rating this question, males tended to be more consistent that did females, though, as distinct groups, Group I did not rate the question appreciably lower than the non-graduates (Group II).

Summary on Counseling Program

Here is a composite of the ratings on the four questions concerning the Counseling Center program:

TABLE IX

COMPOSITE OF RATINGS ON COUNSELING PROGRAMS

Factors	Number	Group I			Group II			Total		
		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Quality of:										
Counseling Center Program	83	3.21	3.17	3.19	3.61	3.23	3.40	3.44	3.20	3.29
Serving Personal and Academic Needs	77	3.08	3.18	3.15	3.31	3.05	3.17	3.21	3.13	3.16
Personal Problem Counseling	51	3.55	3.59	3.57	3.45	3.75	3.61	3.50	3.66	3.59
Career Choice Counseling	65	3.64	3.46	3.51	3.57	3.62	3.60	3.60	3.53	3.55

A cursory view of the preceding data shows considerable inconsistency between questions which appear very similar. The key is the number of "no opinion" responses to the questions.

For example, factors one and two are based on more general, "philosophical" questions: "What is your opinion of TCJC on the quality of the Counseling Center program?," and "How well did the Counseling Center serve your personal and academic needs?" Eighty-three respondents expressed opinion on the first question, and there were 77 respondents to the second. Factors three and four were more specific questions: "What is your opinion of TCJC on the quality of personal problem counseling?," and "What is your opinion of TCJC on the quality of career choice counseling?" On these questions, 51 and 65 respondents rated the questions on the "5-4-3-2-1" basis.

If this "premise" is correct, it may be concluded that the Counseling Center programs are serving rather well the needs of those students who actually seek the assistance of the Center. There appears, as might be expected, to be a reluctance on the part of some students to seek Counseling Center services.

Student Activities Program

Two specific questions dealt with the student activities program.

Quality of the Student Activities Program

Seventy-seven of the 88 respondents expressed an opinion to the question, "What is your opinion of TCJC on the quality of the student activities program?"; eleven respondents expressed no opinion on the question as shown in Table X:

TABLE X

OPINIONS ON THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENT ACTIVITIES PROGRAM

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I - Male	5	8	2	0	0	0	15	63	4.20
Female	10	12	4	1	0	2	27	112	4.15
Total	15	20	6	1	0	2	42	175	4.17
Group II - Male	3	5	4	4	0	4	16	55	3.44
Female	5	10	7	5	0	9	35	76	4.00
Total	8	15	7	5	0	9	35	131	3.74
Total	23	35	13	6	0	11	77	306	3.97

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

Graduates rated the quality of the program much higher than did the non-graduates as a discrete group; it was, however, the non-graduate males who rated the quality of the program at a much lower level.

Serving Social and Cultural Needs

Twenty respondents expressed no opinions on the Student Activities Program serving social and cultural needs. Table XI shows the number rating the program on the 5-4-3-2-1-0 basis and the mean:

TABLE XI

OPINION OF STUDENT ACTIVITIES PROGRAM SERVING

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL NEEDS

Groups	5	4	3	2	1	0*	Number	Points	Average
Group I - Male	4	5	2	1	0	3	12	48	4.00
Female	6	8	8	2	1	4	25	91	3.64
Total	10	13	10	3	1	7	37	139	3.76
Group II - Male	1	2	9	1	2	5	15	44	2.93
Female	1	6	6	2	1	8	16	52	3.25
Total	2	8	15	3	3	13	31	96	3.10
Total	12	21	25	6	4	20	68	232	3.41

* Denotes no response to the question; not included in computation of the ratings.

This factor was rated considerably lower by each group and each subgroup; in general, however, the opinions among the subgroups were consistent with opinions on the quality of student activities. As with the responses on the quality of the program, the non-graduates were considerably lower in their rating than the graduate group.

Part IV. Transcript Requests from Non-Respondents Who Were Enrolled in University-Parallel Programs

The first three parts of this Chapter have been concerned with various types of analyses from the 44 university-parallel graduate respondents and the 44 university-parallel non-graduate respondents.

This part is a brief analysis of the transcript requests submitted by the eleven graduates who did not reply and the 23 university-parallel non-graduates not responding to the study.

University-Parallel Graduates

One university-parallel graduate responded after the data had been analyzed; she was enrolled at North Texas State as an elementary education major.

Nine of the remaining ten requested that the Office of Admissions and Records send transcripts to senior institutions; five requested transcripts be sent to the University of Texas at Arlington; two, to Texas Christian University; one, to the University of South Dakota; and one graduate requested transcripts to both Texas Christian University and the University of Texas at Arlington.

Non-Graduate Requests

Twelve of the 23 non-graduates who did not respond requested transcripts to 9 senior colleges and one junior college. Here is a list of the institutions to which transcripts were sent:

University of Texas at Arlington	2 persons
Texas Christian University	2 persons
Texas Wesleyan College	1 person
Tarleton State College	1 person
Texas Women's University	1 person
North Texas State University	1 person
Rochester Institute of Technology	1 person
Cisco Junior College	1 person
Texas Christian University and the University of Houston	1 person
University of Texas and Texas Wesleyan College	1 person

Eleven of the non-respondents had made no transcript requests to other institutions, though three of this group had requested transcripts for personal ("self") use.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

This study represents the first formal, "extensive" follow-up study of students who have attended Tarrant County Junior College. Two questionnaires were developed: one for those students (2,392) who were enrolled in one or more occupational education courses in spring, 1969, and one for university-parallel graduates (55) last year and a selected sample (67) of university-parallel non-graduates.

Exactly 700 replies were received from the 2,392 occupational education students, of which 39 were from last year's 55 A.A.S. graduates. The rate of return for the entire group of occupational education students was 29.4 percent. Return rate for graduates was 70.9 percent.

Of the 55 university-parallel graduates, 44 replies were received, yielding a return rate of 80 percent. Of the non-graduate sample, 44 of 67 replied for a return of 65.7 percent.

Findings and Conclusions

University-Parallel graduates. In 1968-69, 55 students completed Associate in Arts degree requirements; responses were received for 44 of these graduates. Here are findings based on the general characteristics of this group:

1. Fifteen of the 44 respondents were males, and 29 were females.

2. Eighty-two percent of the group continued to reside in Tarrant County or a contiguous county; eleven graduates continued to reside in other parts of Texas and three had moved to other states. Males appeared no more mobile than females.

3. Just over two-thirds of the graduates were 21 years of age or under and another 20 percent were between 22-25 years of age; twelve percent were "over 25." No differences existed between the ages of males and the ages of females.

4. Three-fourths of the graduates were single while enrolled at TCJC; twenty percent of the respondents were married and five percent were divorced. Again, no differences existed between the two sexes on marital status, except that those who were divorced were males.

5. Only slightly over one-fourth of the A.A. graduates had attended another college prior to entering TCJC.

6. Eighty-two percent of the A.A. degree recipients were enrolled at senior colleges when the study was conducted. A slightly higher percent of the males (87%) were enrolled in senior colleges than females (79%).

University-Parallel Non-Graduates. Recognizing that a substantial number of students may elect to complete two years of study at TCJC without completing the specific degree requirements, a random sample of 67 students was selected; this sample included university-parallel students who should have completed 60-or-more semester hours by the end of the 1968-69 spring semester. These are the findings, based on responses from 44 individuals in this group, equivalent to 65.7 percent of the sample:

1. Almost one-half (20 of 44) of the respondents were men.

2. Eighty percent of this group continued to reside in Tarrant County or an adjoining county, while 16 percent were residing in other parts of the state. Two persons responding to the survey were residing outside Texas. Men tended to be slightly more mobile than women.

3. Over one-third of this group were over 21 years of age; 16 percent of the entire group was "over 30" years of age. Female respondents tended to be slightly older than male respondents.

4. Sixty-six percent of the non-graduate sample were single during their TCJC study, while 32 percent were married and two percent were divorced. A slightly higher percent of the females tended to be married than did the males.

5. Almost one-half (48%) of the non-graduate group had attended another college prior to enrolling at TCJC.

6. Almost three-fourths (73%) of this non-graduate sample were enrolled in a senior college when the survey was conducted.

Conclusion I. Differences in personal characteristics do exist between A.A. degree recipients and university-parallel non-graduates. The non-graduates, compared to degree holders, tend

1. to be slightly older,
2. to be more evenly divided between the sexes,
3. to be married in greater numbers than the degree holders,
4. to have had prior college experience before entering TCJC, and
5. to transfer to senior institutions at a slightly lower rate than do their A.A. degree counterparts.

Conclusion II. Completion of the requirements for the Associate in Arts degree has little, if any, influence upon a students' transferring to a senior institution.

University-Parallel Student Group. Forty-four replies were received from each of the two sub-groups--the A.A. degree recipients and the non-graduate sample. These findings are based on the responses from the two sub-groups.

1. Seventy-seven percent (68 individuals) of the respondents were currently enrolled in baccalaureate degree programs at senior colleges.

2. Of those who transferred, 40 enrolled in senior colleges in Tarrant County, equivalent to 59 percent of this group; another 19 percent enrolled in senior institutions in adjoining counties. Fifty-three of the 68 (78%) continued their study within this metropolitan complex. Only two of this group were attending colleges outside Texas.

3. Texas Christian University enrolled sixteen of the graduates, followed by the University of Texas at Arlington with 15 students. Twelve students entered North Texas State University and nine entered Texas Wesleyan College.

4. Eighteen of this group identified their majors as "Education." Another seven persons identified English as their major, and five were majoring in History. There is reason to believe that some of those in the two latter groups were pursuing teaching careers. Careers in business were being pursued by another 13 respondents.

5. Students experienced what might be termed as "nominal" difficulty in transferring their work to senior colleges; in general, business and psychology courses created the greatest difficulty in transferability to meet specific degree requirements.

6. Students who had entered senior institutions were asked to compare TCJC to their senior institution:

   a. Quality of Instruction, Eighty-one percent indicated that there was no difference or that TCJC was superior.

   b. Academic Standards. Thirty-six percent indicated that standards were higher at senior institutions, while 49 percent indicated no difference in standards.

   c. Faculty Interest. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that faculty interest was more evident at TCJC, while 33 percent indicated there was no difference.

   d. Instructional Media. Of the transfers to senior institutions, 72 percent indicated better use of media at TCJC, while 14 percent indicated that no difference existed.

   e. Class Size. Exactly 50 percent preferred the class size at TCJC and another 30 percent indicated there were no differences.

f. Grading and Testing. Forty-three percent indicated no difference in this area; 19 percent indicated TCJC was superior and 16 percent indicated that senior institutions were superior.

g. Overall Opinion. Nineteen percent expressed a higher rating for their senior institution compared to 44 percent for TCJC; 28 percent indicated no differences.

7. Forty of the 88 respondents had received financial assistance while enrolled at TCJC.

Conclusion III. TCJC must continually maintain and extend relationships in senior institutions, with extensive communication and cooperation with the senior institutions in the County and with North Texas State University.

Conclusion IV. TCJC students who have transferred to senior colleges maintain high opinions of TCJC as an institution and on specific areas related to student attitudes and academic success.

Occupational Education Graduates. Responses were received from 39 of the 1968-69 occupational education graduates, equivalent to a return-rate of 71 percent. Here are some findings from this group:

1. Eighty-seven percent of the occupational graduates continued to reside in Tarrant County with another 10 percent residing in contiguous counties. Only one graduate was residing outside this area; she was employed with the CIA in Washington.

2. The first occupational education graduates tended to be women (33 of 39).

3. The age distribution of the graduates was widely divergent: 46 percent were "under 22"; 18 percent, "22-25"; 8 percent, "26-30"; and 28 percent of the graduates were "over 30" years of age.

4. Exactly two-thirds were single during their TCJC study; 31 percent were married and 2 percent were divorced.

5. Slightly more than one-third (36%) had attended another college prior to entering TCJC.

6. Only four of the occupational education graduates entered senior colleges (all in the immediate area), while one continued study at TCJC. Three of the four entering senior institutions were men; two of these five were employed on part-time bases while continuing their studies.

7. Excluding the five who were enrolled in further education, none of the graduates were unemployed; thirty-two of the 34 were employed full-time and two were employed part-time, both of whom were married.

Conclusion V. Occupational education graduates differ from university-parallel graduates in terms of age and mobility after graduation. In other personal characteristics, there appears to be no substantial differences between the two groups.

Conclusion VI. Occupational education programs are meeting specific training needs existent in Tarrant and adjacent counties, based on the non-mobility and the full employment of the graduates.

Opinions of the Three Groups. On the different questionnaires, there were common questions pertaining to their opinions on selected areas at TCJC; each of these questions required a response on a 5-point scale (5-very good, 4-good, 3-fair, 2-poor, and 1-very poor):

1. Occupational education graduates hold a slightly higher overall opinion of TCJC than do the two university-parallel sub-groups.

2. University-parallel graduates rate "TCJC faculty interest in students" at higher levels than does the other two groups.

3. Occupational education graduates rate academic advisement higher than does the two university-parallel sub-groups.

4. "Quality of Instruction" was rated considerably higher by university-parallel groups than the rating given this area by occupational education graduates.

Conclusion VII. The experience of students, "or point of reference," tends to influence the ratings given to specific areas at TCJC as illustrated by the fact that "faculty interest" and "quality of instruction" was rated higher by university-parallel sub-groups while "academic advising" was rated higher by the occupational education groups.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the foregoing conclusions:

1. that Tarrant County Junior College should continue to cooperate and communicate with area senior institutions (TCU, TWC, UTA, and NTSU) to facilitate transferability and to decrease the possibility of transfer "shock."

2. that TCJC continue to develop and implement occupational education programs on a careful and orderly basis; these programs are serving well the needs of the employment sector of Tarrant County.

3. that a longitudinal study be executed on all of the College's graduates for at least three years after each class has graduated. Such study should reveal the degree of success of our graduates in the employment sector as well as the degree to which other graduates complete their baccalaureate study.

4. that TCJC must extend its efforts in developing improved retention rates in both university-parallel and occupational education. Such efforts should not necessarily be oriented toward urging part-time students to become full-time students, but rather toward urging all students to continually and consistently pursue higher educational attainments.

APPENDICES

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT
1400 FORT WORTH NATIONAL BANK BUILDING
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102
TEL. 817/336-7851

VICE-CHANCELLOR
RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT

October 20, 1969

Dear TCJC Student or Alumnus:

You are the source of some very important information to be used in the future development of educational programs at Tarrant County Junior College. The best way to determine the effectiveness of our programs is ask students who are or have enrolled in these programs.

You will find the enclosed questionnaire can be completed very quickly--probably in less than five minutes; virtually all questions require only a check mark in the appropriate box. Please take a moment to look it over; then a few minutes to complete and mail in the enclosed, postage-paid envelope.

Your responses will be held in complete confidence. Your cooperation and assistance in helping plan Tarrant County Junior College's future is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Jimmie C. Styles

Jimmie C. Styles, Vice Chancellor
Research and Development

JCS:ldc

Enclosures: 2

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Fort Worth, Texas

STUDENT FOLLOW-UP STUDY

1. General Information

Soc. Sec. No. ___-__-____

Name_____
(Last) (First) (Middle/Maiden)

Address_____ Phone_____
(Street) (City) (State) (Zip)

Sex: ( ) Male ( ) Female

Marital Status while at TCJC: ( ) Single ( ) Married ( ) Widowed ( ) Divorced

Present age: ( ) 21 or under ( ) 22 - 25 ( ) 26 - 30 ( ) over 30

2. Did you attend another college prior to entering TCJC?
( ) Yes; please enter the name of that college in COLUMN I below.
( ) No; please go to Question 3.

3. Have you attended another college since leaving TCJC?
( ) Yes; please enter the name of that college in COLUMN III below.
( ) No

If you answered "No" to both of these questions, please go to Question 4 on the back.

If you answered "Yes" to either of these questions, please provide the following information; then continue to Question 4 on the back.

	COLUMN I	COLUMN II	COLUMN III
Name of College		Tarrant Co. Jr. College	
Entered this college (mo/yr)	__/__	__/__	__/__
Left this college (mo/yr)	__/__	__/__	__/__
Number of semester hours completed			
Approximate grade point average			
Major field of study			

4. Which ONE Associate Degree program--listed below--did you consider your major field of study at Tarrant County Junior College?

( ) Aeronautical Technology (A&P Mechanics)
( ) Architectural Technology
( ) Automobile Mechanics
( ) Automotive Technology
( ) Data Processing
( ) Drafting and Design
( ) Electronic Technology
( ) Fire Technology
( ) Law Enforcement
( ) Mid-Management
( ) Associate Diploma Nursing
( ) Office Occupations
  ( ) General Office
  ( ) General Secretarial
  ( ) Legal Secretarial
  ( ) Medical Secretarial
  ( ) Accounting
( ) Refrigeration and Air Conditioning

5. Have you completed all requirements for the Associate Degree program checked above?

( ) Yes; Date completed (month/year):_____/_____. Go to Question 6.
( ) No; Answer questions 5A, 5B, and 5C, then continue to Question 6.

5A. When you entered TCJC, did you already have employable skills in your major field of study?
( ) Yes
( ) No

5B. Are you presently enrolled in TCJC?
( ) Yes; enrolled in ___ semester hours; Go to Question 6.
( ) No; explain why you left TCJC: _____

5C. When you left TCJC, did you have employable skills which enabled you to get a job?
( ) Yes
( ) No

6. Which ONE statement best describes your present status?

( ) Employed full time; date employed (mo/yr): __/__
Job Title _____
Company _____ City _____ State _____

( ) Employed part time; date employed (mo/yr): __/__
Job Title _____
Company _____ City _____ State _____

( ) Full-time college student

( ) Entered Military Service; date entered (mo/yr): __/__

( ) Unemployed, but seeking employment

( ) Other; please specify: _____

7. Using the scale shown in the box at the right, give your opinion on your study at TCJC; circle only one number for each statement?

Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

What is your opinion on:

--the quality of your instruction?	5	4	3	2	1
--the content of your general education courses?	5	4	3	2	1
--the content of your occupational courses?	5	4	3	2	1
--faculty interest in the individual student?	5	4	3	2	1
--the quality of vocational counseling?	5	4	3	2	1
--Tarrant County Junior College?	5	4	3	2	1
--the value of your general education courses?	5	4	3	2	1

Thank you for your cooperation.

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT
1400 FORT WORTH NATIONAL BANK BUILDING
FORT WORTH, TEXAS 76102
TEL. 817/336-7851

January 7, 1970

Dear TCJC Alumnus

You are a source of some very important information to be used in evaluating our progress since 1967 and in planning for the further development of Tarrant County Junior College.

You were enrolled in the University-parallel program and your opinions on your study will provide us with the best measure of the effectiveness of the program. The enclosed questionnaire can be completed very quickly--in about five minutes; virtually all questions require only a check mark.

Take a moment to look it over, then mark it and mail in the enclosed, postage-paid envelope. All responses will be held in complete confidence; your response will be appreciated by January 17, 1970.

Best wishes for success in your present activities, and thank you for your cooperation in supplying this important information.

Cordially

Horace Griffitts
Director of Research

ldc

Enclosures: 2

TARRANT COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Fort Worth, Texas

STUDENT FOLLOW-UP (Phase IB)

1. General Information

Name_____ _____ _____ Soc. Sec. No._____
Last First Middle or Maiden

Address_____ Telephone Number_____
Street City State Zip Code

Sex	Marital Status while at TCJC	Number of Children	Present Age
( ) Male	( ) Single	( ) None	( ) 21 or under
( ) Female	( ) Married	( ) One	( ) 22-25
	( ) Widowed	( ) Two	( ) 26-30
	( ) Divorced	( ) More than two	( ) over 30

2. Did you attend another college prior to entering TCJC?
( ) Yes; complete the information on this college in COLUMN I below.
( ) No; please continue to Question 3.

3. Complete the information on TCJC in COLUMN II below.

4. Have you attended another college since leaving TCJC?
( ) Yes; complete the information on this college in COLUMN III below; continue to #5.
( ) No; please go directly to Question 6 on the back of this page.

	COLUMN I	COLUMN II	COLUMN III
		TCJC	
Name of College (abbreviate)			
Entered this college (mo/yr)	__/__	__/__	__/__
Left this college (mo/yr)	__/__	__/__	__/__
Number of sem. hrs. completed			
No. sem. hrs. currently enrolled			
Approximate grade point average			
Major field of study			

5. Using the scale at the right, compare TCJC with College identified in COLUMN III above:

	Tarrant County			Other College		
	much better	better	same	better	much better	no opinion
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Quality of Instruction	5	4	3	2	1	0
Level of Academic Standards	5	4	3	2	1	0
Faculty Interest in Students	5	4	3	2	1	0
Use of Instructional Media	5	4	3	2	1	0
Class Size	5	4	3	2	1	0
Grading and Testing Procedures	5	4	3	2	1	0
Overall opinion of Colleges	5	4	3	2	1	0

Did you receive an Associate Degree at TCJC?
( ) Yes, with a major in_____; date conferred: (mo/yr) __/__
( ) No, because_____

Did you receive full-credit in transferring your University Parallel courses?
( ) Yes; please go to Question 6 on the reverse side.
( ) No; please identify course(s)_____

6. Using the scale shown in the box at the right, please give your opinion on TCJC in the following areas; circle only the one number per statement.

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Opinion
	5	4	3	2	1	0
What is your opinion of TCJC on:						
--the quality of the Counseling Center program?	5	4	3	2	1	0
--the quality of academic advising? . .	5	4	3	2	1	0
--the quality of personal-problem counseling?	5	4	3	2	1	0
--the quality of career-choice counseling?	5	4	3	2	1	0
--the quality of your instruction? . .	5	4	3	2	1	0
--the student activities program? . .	5	4	3	2	1	0
--faculty interest in individual students?	5	4	3	2	1	0
How well did the Counseling Center serve your personal and academic needs? . .	5	4	3	2	1	0
How well did the Student Activities program serve social and cultural needs?	5	4	3	2	1	0
What is your overall opinion of TCJC? .	5	4	3	2	1	0

7. Were you aware that loans, grants, scholarships, and job placement services were available at TCJC?
( ) No; please go to Question 8.
( ) Yes; answer the following question:
Did you use any of these services?
( ) No, because_____
( ) Yes; please identify_____

8. To what extent did you use these college facilities or engage in these activities?

	Very Often	Often	Some	Seldom	None
	5	4	3	2	1
Student Center facilities					
Cafeteria	5	4	3	2	1
Vending Areas	5	4	3	2	1
Games Areas	5	4	3	2	1
Television Lounge	5	4	3	2	1
Student Center Activities					
Monthly Movies	5	4	3	2	1
Dances	5	4	3	2	1
Cultural/Entertainment Series	5	4	3	2	1
Speaker's Series	5	4	3	2	1

9. Which ONE statement best describes your present status?

( ) presently enrolled as a full-time student
Are you also employed?
( ) No
( ) Yes; Job Title_____ Hours Per Week_____
Date employed (mo/yr) __/__; City of employment_____
Employer_____

( ) presently employed in a full-time position; date employed (mo/yr) __/__
Job Title_____ City_____
Employer_____
Through what means did you secure this job? (check one or more)
( ) TCJC placement service
( ) Texas Employment Commission
( ) private employment agency
( ) newspaper classified ad
( ) information through relative or friend
( ) other; identify_____

( ) presently a member of the Military Services; date entered (mo/yr) __/__

( ) presently not in the labor force because:
( ) full-time homemaker
( ) part-time student; part time employee (or homemaker)
( ) physically unable to work
( ) unemployed, but seeking part-time employment
( ) unemployed, but seeking full-time employment

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION .